



6-08-06

TFW 2142

Atty. Dkt. No. 023627-0301

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Betros, et al.


Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR  
MAINTAINING TWO-WAY  
ASYNCHRONOUS  
NOTIFICATION BETWEEN A  
CLIENT AND A WEB SERVER

Appl. No.: 09/766,439

Filing Date: 01/19/2001

Examiner: K.Y. LIN

Art Unit: 2142

<b>CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING</b>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service's "Express Mail Post Office To Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.	
EV 830406275 US	June 6, 2006
(Express Mail Label Number)	(Date of Deposit)
Ruthie Vallejo	
(Printed Name)	
	
(Signature)	

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on May 30, 2006.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, submitted herewith is a statement of the substance of the interview on May 30, 2006, regarding the above-identified application. The following individuals participated in the interview: (i) Examiner Lin; (ii) David Blumenthal, attorney for applicant; (iii) Justin Sobaje, attorney for applicant; and (iv) Robert Betros, first named inventor.

At the beginning of the interview, the Examiner indicated that he would only listen to our comments, since his Supervisory Examiner was not present at the interview. During the interview, we discussed claim 1 as amended in the reply filed on April 26, 2006. We discussed

the claim language with the Examiner. In particular, we discussed the feature of "two-way asynchronous communication". The Examiner indicated that he would like to see more explanation about "two-way asynchronous communication" in the claims.

We further pointed out some arguments that we made in the reply of April 26, 2006, with regard to the Rangarajan and Cianfrocca references, but we did not discuss the arguments or references in detail during the interview.

At the conclusion of the interview, we asked the Examiner whether we could schedule another interview at which his Supervisor would be present. The Examiner stated that he would not object to a further interview.

No exhibits were shown and no demonstrations were conducted during the interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 5, 2006

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 23392  
Telephone: (310) 975-7965  
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 56,252